

molecule and the second motor molecule. FIG. D of Exhibit 1 emphasizes this distinction set forth in claims 111 and 113.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 10, 41-42 and 54-55 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Oplatka combined with Nagai et al. with additional support from the Merriam-Webster dictionary. Independent claim 54 is directed to a motor that includes rotation of a surface of a cylinder, shaft or cone around a longitudinal axis defined by the cylinder, shaft or cone, wherein an array of motor molecules is disposed upon the surface. As explained above in connection with the 35 U.S.C. §§101 and 102 rejections, Oplatka does not describe any motor with such geometry. In addition, for the reasons explained in applicants' December 29, 2005, response, Nagai et al. does not compensate for this fatal deficiency in Oplatka. Accordingly, the obviousness rejection of claims 54 (and dependent claims 10, 41, 42 and 55) must be reconsidered and withdrawn.

*interview summary OK
CUS 1 10/18/07*

Interview Summary

During the interview on July 17, 2007, the above-noted differences in the geometries between the three naturally-occurring motors, the glass surface experiment in Oplatka, and the presently claimed motors were discussed.

It is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any questions regarding this application, examiner Smith is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number shown below.

Respectfully submitted,

KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP

One World Trade Center, Suite 1600
121 S.W. Salmon Street
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503) 595-5300
Facsimile: (503) 595-5301

By

Wayne W. Rupert
Wayne W. Rupert
Registration No. 34,420